

PACAFDIR90-217

BY ORDER OF THE COMMANDER, PACIFIC AIR FORCES

PACAF DIRECTORY 90-217

21 FEBRUARY 2001

Command Policy

*MANPOWER & ORGANIZATION MISSION PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT

OPR: HQ PACAF/XPMI (Linda L. Winslett)

Certified by: HQ PACAF/XPM (Col Richard H. Zeimet)

Supersedes PACAFDIR 90-217, 14 January 2000

Pages: 5/Distribution: F

This Mission Performance Standard implements AFPD 90-2, Inspector General – The Inspection System. It applies to Wing Commanders and staff with manpower responsibilities assigned under the Objective Wing structure. This Mission Performance Standard supports guidance in the following: AFI 38-101, AFD 38-1, AFI 38-201, AFI 38-203, AFI 38-205, AFMAN 38-208 Vol 1, AFI 38-301, AFI 38-401, AFI 10-201, AFI 10-217, AFI 90-1102, and AFD 90-11. This directory does not apply to Air National Guard (ANG) and the US Air Force Reserve units and members.

The items listed do not constitute the order or limit the scope of the inspection. Specifically, the objective is to gain specifics concerning each inspectable item and identify organizational strengths, and deficiencies that preclude attainment of required capabilities. Units can supplement this publication to add internal compliance items. This directory may be used in whole or in part by HHQ during visits or exercises. Users may add any item(s), which in the exercise of good judgment, requires examination.

The attached Mission Performance Checklist (MPC) is aligned to each pertinent Wing Mission Essential Task (MET), and was developed using the MO Mission Essential Task List (METL), which are based on manpower core competencies. The checklist represents key manpower processes, procedures, and requirements that must be accomplished to ensure successful mission accomplishment by wing level MO operations. Critical inspection items are indicated by a pound sign (#). Inspection results for each MET are based on the cumulative assessment of inspectable items. This relationship ensures the overall final inspection result is based on the METL.

SUMMARY OF REVISIONS

This PACAF Directory supersedes PACAFDIR 90-217, 14 January 2000. It is a total rewrite of the directory. For these reasons, there will be no stars used in this document to indicate change. New or revised material is indicated by an (*).

1. Authorized release of Word (.doc) file can *only be acquired by contacting the appropriate OPR directly.*

JOHN M. WESTON, Colonel, USAF

Deputy Director of Plans & Programs

1 Attachment

Manpower and Organization Mission Performance Checklist

Attachment 1**MANPOWER & ORGANIZATION MISSION PERFORMANCE CHECKLIST**

(For each “yes” response, “explain how you do this”; and each “no” response, “explain why not.”)

WING MET 5 – PROVIDE MISSION SUPPORT AND PROTECT THE FORCE

A1.1. MO MET 1 – MANPOWER MANAGEMENT SUPPORT. Provide manpower management support and services to include consults, authorization and organization change requests, and products as required by base agencies to meet customer needs for improved mission performance, insightful planning, and wise resource utilization decisions as evidenced by compliance with AFI 38-101, AFI 38-201, and other applicable directives.

A1.1.1. MANPOWER ORGANIZATION

A1.1.1.1. (#) Are organization change requests (OCRs) prepared in accordance with Chapter 5, AFI 38-101? (AFI 38-101, Chap 5)

A1.1.1.1.1. Is a MO Office performance measure(s) established and tracked for both the timely and accurate processing of OCRs?

A1.1.1.2. (#) Are MO personnel aware that AFD 38-1 implements the statutory requirements in Title 10, United States Code, Section 8013? (AFD 38-1, para 5)

A1.1.1.3. (#) Does the MO staff understand the civilian position management provisions of AFI 38-201 when processing OCRs?

A1.1.1.3.1. (#) Does the MO staff coordinate all OCRs with responsible parties on base, such as the Civilian Personnel Office, for requests involving changes to civilian positions? (AFI 38-101, Chap 5).

A1.1.1.4. (#) Are the provisions of para 5.3, AFI 38-101 followed when proposing new or test organizations? (AFI 38-101, para 5.3)

A1.1.2. MANPOWER REQUIREMENTS

A1.1.2.1. (#) Does the MO Office apply and implement results of new manpower standards as directed by HQ PACAF/XPM, and within three fiscal quarters? (AFI 38-201, para 2.4.2)

A1.1.2.2. (#) Does the MO Office apply and implement results of existing manpower standards as directed by HQ PACAF/XPM, after major mission change, or when a population change greater than 100 authorizations occurs? Are results implemented in three fiscal quarters? (AFI 38-201, para 2.4.4)

A1.1.2.3. Is a MO Office performance measure(s) established and tracked for Authorization Change Requests timeliness and accuracy?

A1.1.2.3.1. Is a MO Office performance measure established and tracked for the timely distribution of Authorization Change Notices (ACNs)?

A1.1.2.4. (#) Does the MO Office review and validate new and revised civilian position descriptions? (AFI 38-201 Chap 5)

A1.1.2.5. (#) Does the MO Office review and validate manpower requirements for wing Host-Tenant Support Agreements (HTSA) and Inter-Service Support Agreements (ISSA)? (AFI 205-201, para 1.4.6.8)

A1.1.2.6. (#) Does the MO Office validate and process Contract Manpower Equivalent (CME) requirements? (AFI 38-201, para 6.1)

A1.1.3. MANPOWER DATA SYSTEMS

A1.1.3.1. (#) Does the MO Chief ensure all MDS users read all MDS and related documentation, and are trained in all required areas of MDS operations? (HQ PACAF MDS CONOPS, para 3)

WING MET 2 – PROVIDE RAPIDLY DEPLOYABLE FORCE

A1.2. MO MET 2 – WARTIME MANPOWER SUPPORT. Provide wartime manpower support to include contingency/exercise deployment planning, wartime manpower requirements support, review of base support plans, and validation of READY requirements in compliance with AFI 38-205, AFI 10-217, and other applicable directives.

A1.2.1. (#) Does the MO build/update Deployment Requirement Manning Documents (DRMDs) and flow the plan information to the control staff? (AFI 38-205, para 3.4.3.6.3)

A1.2.1.1. Is a MO Office performance measure developed and tracked for A1.2.1 concerning product accuracy and timeliness to the PRU?

A1.2.2. (#) Does the MO analyze ACRs to ensure there are no adverse wartime UTC impacts? (AFI 38-205, para 3.4.3.5)

A1.2.3. (#) Does the MO provide unit SORTS monitors with deployment and in-place requirement and authorization information to assist them in comparing authorizations to requirements? (Gen Ref AFI 10-201; Specific Ref AFI 38-205, para 3.4.3.6.1;)

A1.2.4. (#) Does the MO assist commanders in determining or validating requirements and exemptions to support the scenario of the Resource Augmentation Duty (READY) program? (AFI 10-217, para 2.4.2 & AFI 38-205, para 3.4.3.6.2)

WING MET 5 – PROVIDE MISSION SUPPORT AND PROTECT THE FORCE

A1.3. MO MET 3 – PRODUCTIVITY ENHANCEMENT FUNCTION. Provide productivity enhancement programs and direction as evidenced by compliance with AFI 38-301, AFI 38-401, and other applicable directives.

A1.3.1. PRODUCTIVITY ENHANCEMENT CAPITAL INVESTMENT (PECI) PROGRAM

A1.3.1.1. (#) Does the MO promote the Peci Program? (AFI 38-301, para 1.5.4)

A1.3.1.2. (#) Does the MO submit a Report of Peci Program Expenditures and Benefits report every six months from: operational date for Fast Payback Capital Investment (FASCAP) (AFI 38-301, para 3.5.2.1-3.5.2.2); and, date of funds received for PIFs (AFI 38-301, para 4.5.1-4.5.1.2), until project amortizes? (General Reference AFI 38-301, para 1.5.4)

A1.3.1.3. (#) Does the MO maintain an auditable project file? (General Reference AFI 38-301, para 1.5.4; Specific Ref para 2.8)

A1.3.1.4. (#) Does the MO ensure that manpower deletions in the Authorization Change Request (ACR) become effective during the same fiscal quarter the equipment becomes operational and remain effective until the project amortizes? (General Reference AFI 38-301, para 1.5.5; Specific Ref 3.4.7.2)

A1.3.2. INNOVATIVE DEVELOPMENT THROUGH EMPLOYEE AWARENESS (IDEA) PROGRAM

A1.3.2.1. (#) Does the MO provide support for the alternate processing of ideas (e.g., individuals without access to IPDS, submitters not in the Personnel Data System, classified ideas, and nondisclosure of Social Security Number (SSN), etc)? (AFI 38-401, para 1.5.4)

A1.3.2.2. (#) Does the MO perform IDEA Program, unit staff assistance visits? (AFI 38-401, para 1.5.5)

A1.3.2.3. (#) Does the MO conduct training on the use of IPDS and administration of the IDEA Program? (AFI 38-401, para 1.5.6)

A1.3.2.4. (#) Does the MO effectively promote the IDEA program? (AFI 38-401, paras 1.5.7 & 6.7)

A1.3.2.5. (#) Does the MO develop an annual budget to support IDEA program requirements? (AFI 38-401, para 1.5.8)

A1.3.2.6. (#) Does the MO resolve disputed IDEA cases, and report decisions to management? (AFI 38-401, para 1.5.9)

A1.3.2.7. (#) Does the MO respond to high-level IDEA inquiries and audits? (AFI 38-401, para 1.5.10)

A1.3.2.8. (#) Does the MO report standard IDEA metrics to commanders (e.g., number of ideas submitted/approved, tangible savings, etc)? (AFI 38-401, para 1.5.15)

A1.3.2.9. (#) Does the MO process IDEA award payments for inventions, patents, and alternately processed ideas? (AFI 38-401, para 1.5.16)

A1.3.2.10. (#) Does the MO track IDEA submissions and evaluations in IPDS? (AFI 38-401, para 1.5.17)

A1.3.2.11. (#) Does the MO assist IDEA submitters in processing their original IDEA as well as requests for reconsideration? (AFI 38-401, para 1.5.18)

A1.3.2.12. (#) Does the MO ensure the unit IDEA POC listings in IPDS are updated, as required? (AFI 38-401, para 1.5.19)

A1.3.2.13. (#) Does the MO ensure management validates the accuracy of tangible savings reported by IDEA evaluators and resultant awards? (AFI 38-401, para 1.5.22)

A1.4. MO MET 4 – COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES FUNCTION. Conduct/support commercial activities studies under conditions specified and IAW OMB Circular A-76, AFI 38-203, and other publications and directives.

A1.4.1. (#) Has the MO reviewed all in-house Commercial Activities (CAs) for potential competition within the past 5 years? (Check YLR, YNR, & use suggested format) (AFI 38-203, para 4.3.2.1)

A1.4.2. (#) Has the MO reviewed contracted CAs for possible unreasonable cost and/or unsatisfactory performance before solicitation? (Check MO/LGC correspondence and COMPARE listings) (AFI 38-203, para 15.2.3.2.2.1, and para 8.4.1.3.7)

A1.4.3. (#) Has the MO ensured all positions currently under study have been Military Essentiality Code (MES) “R” coded? (AFI 38-203, para 8.4.1.7)

A1.4.4. (#) Has the MO ensured that all current MEO positions have been identified with an RSC “M” or “S” code and an MES “S” code? (MEOs less than 6 years old) (AFI 38-203, para 8.4.1.33)

A1.4.5. (#) Does the MO maintain complete files (including work statements with revisions or changes, management plan, transition plan, cost/MEO data, cost comparison form and computer generated COMPARE form, technical performance plan, and appeal data of all cost comparisons and direct conversions for 10 years? (AFI 38-203, para 8.4.1.34) (Check Commercial Activity Management Information System (CAMIS) report for list of all studies)

A1.4.6. (#) Does the MO Officer maintain oversight of MEOs to ensure tasks outlined in the PWS are performed within resources allocated by HQ USAF/XPM as estimated in the cost comparison? (AFI 38-203, para 8.4.1.36, and Chap 19)

A1.4.7. (#) Does the MO ensure missing and/or workload adjustments or modifications to the PWS are made, and, when appropriate, MDS is updated? (AFI 38-203, para 8.4.1.36)

A1.4.8. (#) When changes are made to MEO resources does the MO ensure the expansion rules of Chap 15 are not exceeded? (AFI 38-203, para 15.2.1)

A1.4.9. (#) Does the MO ensure requirements for recompeting MEOs every 5 or 10 years are met? (AFI 38-203, para 19.2.3 and 19.2.4)

A1.4.10. (#) Are monthly CAMIS reports completed and forwarded to HQ PACAF by established date? (AFI 38-203, para 8.4.1.9)

A1.5. MO MET 5 – PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT. Provide wing Performance Management Program oversight, guidance, and direction to ensure METS, plans, reports, reviews, and process improvements are accomplished and reported IAW AFI 90-1102, AFI 38-201, AFMAN 38-208, Vol 1, and HHQ direction.

A1.5.1. (#) Does the wing have a performance plan which uses the PACAF developed and deployed wing METs and performance measures? (AFI 90-1102, para 1.9.1)

A1.5.1.1. (#) If applicable, were “mission unique” METs approved by the PACAF/CC? (AFI 90-1102, para 1.9)

A1.5.2. (#) Is a system in place to continuously monitor the wing’s performance of METs? (AFI 90-1102-1.9.2)

A1.5.3. (#) Does the MO manage the wing’s performance management program? (AFI 90-1102, para 1.11.1)

A1.5.4. (#) Does the MO provide the wing leadership and functionals guidance for development, validation, deployment, coordination, and reporting of elements required by the performance plan? (AFI 90-1102, para 1.11.2)

A1.5.5. (#) Does the MO lead the standardization of like METs, performance measures, and standards for like units throughout the wing? (AFI 90-1102, para 1.11.3)

A1.5.6. (#) Does the MO provide performance improvement guidance and services for improvement initiatives and are they key members of performance improvement efforts? (AFI 90-1102, para 1.11.4)

A1.5.7. (#) Does the MO Office offer and conduct consultant services? (AFMAN 38-208 Vol 1, Chap 3)

A1.5.8. (#) Does the MO assist local customers through management engineering efforts? (i.e., reengineering, MEO, activity based costing (ABC), modeling and simulation, benchmarking, process and task improvement and other management studies, etc.) (AFI 38-201, para 1.4.6.3)

A1.5.9. (#) Does the MO forward recommended best practices to PACAF/XP for review and approval for entry into the Best Practices Clearinghouse at AFMIA? (AFI 90-1102, para 1.11.5)